

December 8, 1965

STATINTL

V. CHERNOV

## What's Behind the "Penkovsky Papers"

TWO and a half years ago, on May 11, 1963, the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R. condemned Oleg Penkovsky, a Soviet citizen, as a paid agent of British and American intelligence services, and Greville Wynne, a British subject, as a spy and go-between. Driven into a corner by the incontrovertible evidence cited against them Penkovsky and Wynne had publicly confessed their guilt.

The court passed sentence of death on Penkovsky and on the afternoon of May 16th the sentence was carried out. Wynne was sentenced to 3 years in prison. The blow to British and American intelligence, which had counted heavily on Penkovsky in their hostile activity against the Soviet Union, was all the more painful in that with Penkovsky and Wynne a whole pack of British and American agents working under cover of diplomatic passports was exposed. These persons were expelled from the Soviet Union as having aided the condemned pair.

The secret agents received their just deserts. Their Washington and London masters suffered some pretty bad moments. Justice had triumphed; the case was closed. The very name of Penkovsky began to sink into oblivion.

Now, suddenly, publication of the so-called "Penkovsky Papers" has brought it into the limelight again. That these "Papers" are a forgery, a fresh piece of anti-Sovieteering by the Langley experts in falsification (Langley, just outside of Washington, is the headquarters of the Cen-

tral Intelligence Agency)—that is glaringly obvious. So crudely fabricated are they, so many are the absurdities and downright lies they contain that it is easy to discern the hand of the CIA "experts" headed by Ray S. Cline, CIA deputy director for intelligence.

Reputable Western newspapers comment on the "Penkovsky Papers" with caustic irony and openly name the CIA as their author. Victor Zorza, a British journalist known for his anti-Soviet sentiments, writes in the *Guardian*: "Indeed, the book itself contains the evidence showing certain parts of it to be a forgery, even though other sections of the book are evidently made up of intelligence information provided by Penkovsky long before his arrest," and then draws the conclusion that it could only have been compiled in the CIA. And news analyst Chapman Pincher writes in the *Daily Express*: "From inquiries I made in the U.S. I am satisfied that the Papers were produced as a deliberate propaganda project by the Central Intelligence Agency in Washington."

In the CIA itself they seem to have grasped the fact that protestations of innocence would be foolish. "A spokesman for the CIA," writes the *Christian Science Monitor*, "told this newspaper that the manuscript of the papers and a commentary by newsmen Frank Gibney had been given to them before publication."

There is little point in reviewing the contents of the "Papers." In the

words of the Belgian *De Standaard*, a bourgeois newspaper, they were "borrowed from the arsenal of the most hysterical anti-Communist propaganda." But one thing does require elucidation. The authors of the "Papers" take every opportunity to bolster the claim that Penkovsky was privy to the Soviet Union's "top secrets"—political and economic as well as military—and that by betraying them to the Americans and the British he did infinite harm to the Soviet state. Is that really so?

The harm done was, in truth, considerable. As stated in the verdict, "much of the information Penkovsky passed on to British and American intelligence... was of secret and top secret classification, and some of it constituted state and military secrets of the Soviet Union."

That, however, does not mean that the harm he did was in any degree irreparable. Penkovsky was never directly associated with the military and scientific bodies engaged in producing weapons of the newest type. He himself testified, during the preliminary investigation of his case, that the information on rocketry which he gave the British and Americans in 1961 was gleaned from a refresher course for officers he attended at the Dzerzhinsky Artillery Academy in 1957-58. And in court he admitted that though his chiefs in London readily accepted this information, they told him it was too general and related to outdated missiles, whereas they required

Continued

CPYRGHT